

BOARD OF DIRECTORS MINUTES

SUNDAY, OCTOBER 29TH, 2017

Held in Suite 1200 of the University Center at 3600 McTavish Street in Montreal, Quebec, H3A 0G3

Attendance: Munavvar Tojiboeva (President), Maya Koparkar (Vice-President Internal), Jemark Earle (Vice-President Student Life), Jonathan Glustein (Member at Large), Simon Shubbar (Member at Large), Isabella Anderson (Member at Large), Ellen Chen (Member at Large), Noah Lew (Member at Large), Dany Morcos (Member at Large), Sophie Schaffer-Wood (Member at Large), Alexander Scheffel (Member at Large), Ryan Hughes (General Manager) (non-voting), Michal Chernov (GM Assistant, non-voting).

Suspended: Arisha Khan (Vice-President Finance)

Regrets: N/A

AGENDA

- 1. Call to Order: 19:05;
- 2. Adoption of the Agenda ADOPTED;

VP Student Life calls to add a question period or discussions to the agenda. President suggests putting it at the end.

3. Update on the HVAC project;

The second location for SSMU tenants that McGill was looking at has fallen through, so now the GM states that we're back to looking at the Peel location. SACOMMSS requested to see the location, accepted request by the deputy provost's office. The realtors are also in the process of doing a survey in order for us to take a look at that and find the appropriate space. We can't order any moving materials before we have a moving company. Second floor washroom has expanded a bit so they will have to take a little space in Sadie's old kitchen Jonathan Nordland



proposed some rooms in McConnell and Macdonald engineering buildings for legislative council meetings and the GA.

- 4. Approval of Board of Directors minutes;
 - a. 2017-10-15 APPROVED VIA ELECTRONIC VOTE;
 - b. 2017-10-22 **APPROVED**;
- 5. Ratification of Judicial Board Interim Order APPROVED;

President mentions IR of Governance section 2, we have to ratify it. GM mentions that all directors must have read this document and know the consequences of this. Director Anderson asks the president if every director will go on online ratification or if the 3 directors will be excluded? Director Anderson seems to think that this is a weird decision because there's a petition that's been sent around students and has been heavily supported and seems more practical and fair. Director Anderson would like to have the student body vote on all the names rather than just a few. Director Glustein is the petitioner of this Judicial Board. In his petition, Director Glustein asked the J-Board to suspend the results from the GA and then have a hearing. Director Anderson asks if, due to the fact that the online ratification is so quick, is it why we want to have the hearing so soon? Director Glustein requested the J-Board to have an early hearing date before November 8. Marina from The Daily would like to ask a question but Director Glustein mentions that he doesn't believe that members from the gallery are to participate in debates. However, Director Anderson explains that gallery members do have the right to participate in debate. Marina from the daily suggests looking at IRs of Governance. President finds it in Internal Regulations of Governance section 5.3.1. Marina from The Daily asks how is it legal for directors to be sitting on the board still if they haven't been ratified. VP Student Life also asks if they will just be sitting or voting members. Director Anderson explains we would have to make sure if they are ratified before November 15, but they would be abstaining from voting. Director Glustein explains that what they're trying to do is trying to stop this. Director Glustein explains that all members have to be ratified but it should be resolved before November 15, when the new Board of Directors starts their mandate. There might be a special ballot online. Director Anderson asks if they don't make a decision by November 8, will we have enough time to go with online ratification. Director Glustein confirms that we will have enough time. Director Glustein expressed to Judicial Board that this is very time sensitive. Their reasoning behind the order is that there will be 9 ratified directors and no replacement provision in the constitution, so these 3 seats will be vacant for the whole year. President also reminds Directors to focus on the



decision itself. VP Student Life voices that he wishes a member of the J-Board was here so the Directors could ask all the questions. The President explains that the J-Board member who read this did understand the time limitation for this decision and knows that it's time sensitive. VP Student Life wants to know if we can approve this with clarification. Director Glustein explains that we could approve this motion and then send the J-Board all the questions. Director Glustein says we either need to approve or not approve it. We cannot amend a J-Board decision. Director Glustein agrees with the President that he wants to avoid a constitutional crisis. If the GA motion continues as it is, and then it gets passed online and ratified. Then there would have to be another J-Board decision. There would be conflicting issues and if there's a motion that passes and a J-Board decision that is not constitutional, that will take a while to resolve. President proposes to pass the motion and then send the question to the J-Board. VP Student Life would like to propose sending the J-Board questions and then have an online vote amongst the Directors within 12 hours. Director Lew asks if this problem only arises only if we don't have a decision by the 15th. Director Anderson explains that the J-Board wouldn't take as much time on this just because they understand that it's time sensitive. The President also wants to avoid having two problems. The campaigning period has already started and they might be campaigning already for it right now. Director Glustein explains that J-Board accepted their jurisdiction on the timeline of November 8th. Marina from The Daily asks if Director Scheffel and VP Internal and Director Lew will be abstaining to this vote. Director Lew explains that he was not personally named to this motion therefore it does not directly concern himself or Director Scheffel. Marina from The Daily asks if this decision directly affects if Directors Lew and Scheffel will be reappointed or not? Director Glustein states that all the affected parties are not mentioned in the case. President would like to remind the directors that we are not deciding a constitutional question but rather that we need to focus on the process. Last year, the directors talked about the J-Board making decision with 4/5th of majority. The President explains that we're just here to follow if it was done correctly or not. VP Student Life questions if we would have to make a decision or debate on whether these directors who are not ratified can still vote during motions? The President would like to ask the directors to help her formulate the question to send to the J-Board. The J-Board has reached out to the petitioner and to the respondent about hearing dates but no date has been decided yet. The President proceeds to voting:

In favor: VP Student life, President, Director Chen, Director Morcos, Director Schaffer-Wood, Director Anderson, Director Shubbar (7)

Opposed: None



Abstaining: Director Glustein, Director Lew, Director Scheffel and VP Internal (4)

7-4; this motion **passes.**

6. Motion to strike a special committee on Anti-Semitism - APPROVED;

(moved by Director Glustein, seconded by Director Tojiboeva)

The President asks if there's any debate on this motion. VP Student Life thinks the committee shouldn't only be consisted of directors. Director Glustein clarifies that it will not be, as it can be seen in the motion. Director Glustein also explains that he consulted the different Jewish groups on campus and that they were very interested in forming this committee. Director Glustein wants to create a committee to consult on the debate of Anti-Semitism that has been present at SSMU for the past few years. The task will be to combat Anti-Semitism at SSMU and McGill. It will meet once every two weeks and will report to Legislative Council and Board of Directors. Director Morcos agrees with this idea and the committee terms; however, he is worried that by implementing this committee we are only giving one side the chance to have a voice. Director Morcos would like to state for the record that he is neither pro or against BDS. He would like to know if this committee could have a seat for BDS. Director Glustein explains that BDS will not have a seat on this committee and will only be composed of Jewish organizations and groups on campus. Director Morcos asks if there will be a director and councillor to balance things out. Director Glustein questions what balance Director Morcos is referring to. The President explains that these two positions' roles will be to report back to the Board and Council. Director Glustein explains that not every Jewish issue is related to BDS. Director Anderson explains that there's other Board of Directors committees haven't even met yet so she's wondering how this committee will be coming along? Director Glustein explains that he hopes that the new directors do sit on those committees and are actually involved. Director Glustein explains that the representatives of the Jewish community will be definitely more committed to meeting up; he has already reached out to these groups and there is a definite interest. Director Anderson also wants to know who will be chairing this committee? VP Student Life wanted to ask the same question. Director Glustein explains that for the next two weeks while he's still on the board he will help organize a preliminary meeting and to elect a chair who will have full voting rights. VP Internal would like to know if we could amend 1.3.e to say that the meetings will happen a few times during the year or the semester instead of once every two weeks. Director Glustein thinks this is necessary in order to have the commitment function. Marina from The Daily asks why Israel on Campus has a seat if it's a political club. Director Glustein explains they are not political anymore; they are there to discuss Jewish culture, they will be there as a club. Marina from The



Daily also asks why Anti-Zionism is on the agenda for this committee. Director Glustein explains that it would be foolish to ignore the debate on Zionism. The context of which more Anti-Semitism of SSMU in the past is on debates on Anti-Zionism. Marina from The Daily asks if there would be an idea to include a member from Anti-Zionist organization. Director Glustein explains that this is only going to be for Jewish community members.

Unanimously passes.

7. Motion to bring General Assembly SSMU Constitutional Changes to Referendum – **APPROVED**;

(moved by Director Glustein, seconded by Director Earle)

VP Student Life explains that this will be presented to Council on Thursday. There is a suggestion increasing the number of students to 350 students. The proposed changes are fair according to VP Student Life. Director Glustein agrees with VP Student Life and there's a petition going around with about 500+ signatures now. Tre Mansdoerfer and Alexander Dow reached out to Director Glustein and he reached out to VP Student Life. VP Student Life and Glustein also discussed the possibility of not reaching quorum if the number is increased. Director Lew is happy to see this in front of us. The GA is very inaccessible for majority of McGill students, online voting is more accessible for students. This letter was created by engineers and was pretty inaccessible for them. The gm explains that the Quebec law requires a live meeting. The president explains that we don't need to have 2 GAs by law, we could simply have one. Director Lew asks if we don't reach quorum it's still sent to online voting. We would call it a consultative session. Director Lew says that there's been concerns of the democratic process of the GA. Member of the gallery from The McGill Tribune asks what happens if we can't reach quorum? Director Anderson explains that the vote won't be binding and will go for online ratification. Director Anderson explains that this is why faculty representation was removed last year from the GAs. Marina from The Daily asks if there could be a change to this to also add some more robust advertising for GA so that we could actually meet quorum. The President explains that it's been done in the past and that it doesn't change if people are interested or not. Director Glustein tells Marina that the Board can mandate to put a certain amount of money to advertising for the GA. Director Glustein lets Marina from The Daily know that he will personally bring that up for the next Board. Director Anderson would also have to be put under the president's mandate. Director Scheffel explains that having a substantial amount of people from the whole society is more important than the number of faculty representation. Member of gallery wants to know how we could better organize for the GA to end on time to make sure it's accessible for everyone? President says that speaker should



make the debate more conducive. Director Scheffel also explains that many people didn't go because of the timing. Councillor Mansdoerfer is bringing this motion up for discussion at this week's council meeting on November 2nd.

Moving to voting on this motion: unanimously passes.

8. Discussion on the VP External's proposed Constitutional Amendments;

President explains that this document was quite confusing to follow because the specific clauses weren't included. Director Anderson explains that it was confusing to follow because the original document with the questions wasn't sent. Director Anderson explains she doesn't understand what the purpose is of this document without the original constitutional amendments that are clearer? Director Glustein explains that he also didn't know what VP External wanted the Board to do with this and it was just a long summary of all constitutional amendments. Marina from The Daily wonders if this is a student-initiated thing then what would be the timeline for approving this since it won't be approved today. President explains that we will have to double check for this. Director Anderson that there's multiple questions in the document that are all being summarized and would have to be discussed by the current Board and then the next Board and then voted on in the next GA. Director Glustein echoes what Director Anderson said. In the document sent by VP External there's about 100 pages of constitutional changes and reviewing this with legal might cost thousands of dollars. The main problem that Director Glustein has with this is the fact that it's undemocratic and that it packaged a huge amount of changes in one document instead of separating them. It would be presenting to the membership a vote that is very difficult to vote upon. There's a lot of things that were addressed to Board of Directors, Legislative Council and the GA, etc. Director Anderson feels uncomfortable that this didn't go to the GA for students to vote upon and that this came directly to the Board. The President says that she also thinks it's unfair because there's a lot of student questions that were brought up and should have the same conditions of going through that processes. The GM explains to the Board that SSMU could hold a special referendum at any time. The GM also explains that the issue with multiple amendments that we would have to consult with the previous amendments and to make sure that they comply with all the other governing documents. Director Glustein explains that it was less about legal and more about making it accessible to the membership and making it to members as accessible as possible. Last year's ballot there was 4,500 votes abstaining and 2,300 in favor which makes it look like it was inaccessible to people to vote on. Marina from The Daily asks if this wouldn't solve part of the problem if the movers agreed to add a clause if it's passed through legal review? President



explains that it would be dangerous to bring something to a vote if we might not be able to actually accomplish it. Marina from The Daily states that this was initiated by 100 students and it's not just coming from nowhere. Director Anderson explains that the Directors don't have the original document with the individual questions and that it's simply a summary and that this document was sent in a bit too late for the board to be able to make a decision. Director Shubbar explains that the board has not received any petition about this. Director Anderson answers Marina from The Daily that the ideal timeline will be before the winter GA. Director Shubbar explains that these will need to be sent to us in a correct format. Director Lew explains that it's difficult to set a timeline if we don't have the correct documents. Director Glustein wants to move to question period if we only have media questions now.

9. Question Period (5);

A reporter from the McGill Tribune asks if the GA date was announced late. President explains that the date was announced online and that late submissions for motions could be sent to the Speaker. Director Anderson thinks that there was a lot of student advocacy campaigns weren't advertised properly online by SSMU and that she was disappointed with that. Director Anderson explains that this was sent out very late and for students to not be able to debate it. Director Shubbar agrees with Director Anderson that he doesn't want to push this onto students to vote on especially so late in the elections. Marina from The Daily knows for a fact that this was submitted for a while and wonders why the elections officers didn't take care of this, seeing as the President and the GM had access to the whole document for a while? The President explains that it has to go through Board first and submit a petition to change the constitution. Marina from the Daily asks why this wasn't submitted to the Board and rather only to elections SSMU. Director Anderson explains that it has to go to the Board first. The President also explains that it's not always shown to the GM or the President herself because it's Election SSMU that takes care of that. Marina from The Daily asks why we are sending this motion of constitutional changes to the GA. Director Glustein explains that this has to be voted upon first. Director Lew explains that the GA is a forum for students to meet and to make decisions once a semester. Marina from the daily asks if we can set a legal timeline for this? The President explains that it will have to be before the winter 2018 semester.

Members of the gallery are asked to leave the room for Confidential Session to begin.

10. Confidential session;

a. Appointment of International Student Representative Archana Lokesh -APPROVED;

This is unanimously approved.

b. Motion to move the mandate from the investigation / mediation from the General Manager to the HR Manager-APPROVED;

This is unanimously approved.

c. Motion to remove the General Manager from all Governing bodies, unless he is specially requested by either the Chair or the Speaker of the Committee in question to attend-APPROVED;

This is unanimously approved.

d. Mandate the HR Manager to send out an anonymous feedback form to assist the mental health needs of the SSMU staff and to provide recommendations as to what resources are required for the November 12th meeting - APPROVED;

This is unanimously approved.

11. Adjournment: **22:16.**

Next Board meeting: Sunday, November 5th, 2017 from 19:00-20:00 in the SSMU Boardroom

Muna Tojiboeva, President

2017-11-06

Michal Chernov, GM Assistant